fw/

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,638	10/07/2003	Charlene Wang	US920063	5097

7590 01/20/2006

Han-Yi Lee
BAYSHORE PATENT GROUP, LLC.
520 Chantecler Dr.
Fremont, CA 94539

EXAMINER
LE, NHAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/680,638	**Applicant(s)** WANG, CHARLENE	
	Examiner Nhan T. Le	**Art Unit** 2685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 October 2003*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2001/005595 in view of Winkler (US 2002/0160820).

As to claim 1, Cheng teaches a telephone-controlling device for integrating communication comprising: a microprocessor (see fig. 1, number 210, paragraph 0016) is used to control a telephone interface circuit and a interface circuit, and to render the telephone interface circuit to proceed to connecting with an external telephone network, and to render the interface circuit to proceed to connecting with a headset; the telephone interface circuit (see fig. 1, number 220, paragraph 0016) is connected with the microprocessor, and is used to connect with the external telephone network; the interface circuit is connected with the microprocessor, and is used to proceed with wireless two-way transmission of sound messages with the headset (see fig. 1, number 220, paragraph 0016); thereby when in receiving a phone call by way of the external telephone network, the microprocessor performs controlling in order that the headset communicates with the phone call directly (see paragraph 0016). Cheng fails to teach wherein the device utilizes the Bluetooth communication. Winkler teaches wherein the communication utilizes the Bluetooth communication between the headsets (see fig. 1, numbers 101, 102, paragraphs 0016-0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Winkler into the system of Cheng in order to improve the mobility between the devices (as suggested by Winkler paragraph 0017).

As to claim 3, the combination of Cheng and Winkler teaches wherein the bluetooth interface circuit includes: an antenna; a bluetooth module connecting with the antenna, and connecting with the microprocessor to proceed with wireless two-way voice transmission with the bluetooth headset (see Cheng fig. 2, number 200, paragraph 0016).

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2001/005595 in view of Winkler (US 2002/0160820) further in view of Gunn (US 5,905,794).

As to claim 2, the combination of Cheng and Winkler fails to teach wherein the telephone interface circuit includes: a rectifier connecting with a telephone line, wherein the telephone line is connected with the external telephone network; a tone detector connecting with the rectifier and outputting ringing signals for the microprocessor to detect whether there are the ringing signals; a hanging hook controller connecting with the microprocessor and being used to render the microprocessor to control on/off hook to thereby cut off or connect with the external telephone network; a speech network circuit connected with the hanging hook controller, the rectifier, and a second external analog voice-input/output terminal separately for mutual receiving and transmitting vocal messages with the external telephone network. Gunn teaches wherein the telephone interface circuit includes: a rectifier (see fig. 9, number 994, col. 8, lines 34-65) connecting with a telephone line, wherein the telephone line is connected with the external telephone network; a tone detector (see fig. 9, number 910) connecting with the rectifier and outputting ringing signals for the microprocessor to detect whether there are the ringing signals; a hanging hook controller (see fig. 9, numbers 920, 970, col. 8, lines 34-65) connecting with the microprocessor and being used to render the microprocessor to control on/off hook to thereby cut off or connect with the external telephone network; a speech network circuit (see fig. 9, number 994, col. 8, lines 34-65) connected with the hanging hook controller, the rectifier, and a second external analog voice-input/output terminal (see fig. 9, number 904, col. 8, lines 34-65) separately for mutual receiving and transmitting vocal messages with the external telephone network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Gunn into the system of Cheng and Winkler in order to detect the caller identification information.

3. Claim 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2001/005595 in view of Winkler (US 2002/0160820) further in view of Karabinis (US 2003/0054762).

As to claim 4, the combination of Cheng and Winkler fails to teach wherein the bluetooth interface includes further an ADC/DAC connecting with the blue-tooth module, so as to convert sound messages transmitted between the blue-tooth module and a first external analog voice-input/output terminal. Karabinis teaches wherein the blue-tooth interface includes further an ADC/DAC connecting with the blue-tooth module, so as to convert sound messages transmitted between the blue-tooth module and a first external analog voice-input/output terminal (see fig. 15, numbers 1544, 1546, 1552, paragraph 0101). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Karabinis into the system of Cheng and Winkler in order to convert the signals before transmitting and receiving.

As to claim 5, the combination of Cheng, Winkler and Karabinis teaches wherein the first external analog voice-input/output terminal is electrically connected with the second external analog voice-input/output terminal (see Cheng, fig. 2, numbers 200, 240, paragraphs 0016, 0017).

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2001/005595 in view of Winkler (US 2002/0160820) further in view of Shearer et al (US 2004/0203351).

As to claim 6, the combination of Cheng and Winkler fails to teach wherein the Blue-tooth interface circuit includes further a recharge circuit to provide recharging electric power for the blue-tooth headset. Shearer teaches wherein the bluebook powered up another device such as the headset (see paragraph 0005). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Shearer into the system of Cheng and Winkler in order to delegate or transfer the use of some functionality of the communication apparatus to the device.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2001/005595 in view of Winkler (US 2002/0160820) further in view of Kimata (US 20020032039).

As to claim 7, the combination of Cheng and Winkler fails to teach a telephone transfer switch connecting with the microprocessor to render the microprocessor to proceed to transferring with the bluetooth headset. Kimata teaches a telephone transfer switch connecting with the microprocessor to render the microprocessor to proceed to transferring with the bluetooth headset (see fig. 5, number 65, paragraph 0043). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kimata into the system of Cheng and Winkler in order to perform switching transmitting/receiving modes.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2001/005595 in view of Winkler (US 2002/0160820) further in view of Tsai et al (US 20020052181).

As to claim 8, the combination of Cheng and Winkler fails to teach small light Switch connecting with the processor to render the processor to turn on small light wherein the small light provide a minute amount of illumination. Tsai teaches wherein the small light switch to active the display window (see paragraph 00266). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kimata into the system of Cheng and Winkler in order to improve visibility to the users.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhan T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7892. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-05:00 (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

N. Le

Nhan Le

Nguyen Vo
1-18-2006

NGUYEN T. VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER